

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1 and 46 were amended and claims 2 and 6 were canceled. Remarks shall address the pending claims.

In the Office Action claims 1 and 7-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. While not conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have removed the term "glycerol monostearate" from Claims 1 and 7-26 and therefore the rejection is moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action claims 1, 7-26, and 49-61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment the rejections have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action claims 1, and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by British Patent Application 2,078,760, citing the reason already set forth in paragraph 3 of the previous action. Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action claims 15-19 and 49-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over British Patent Application 2,078,760 essentially for reasons of record, noting the following... the exact surface roughness of the package would have been within the skill level of the art dependent on the exact properties desired for the inner wall...clearly, the inner wall of British -760 would have some degree of surface roughness.

Applicants traverse this rejection for the following reason.

British Patent Application 2,078,760 teaches packaging that reduces or eliminates the deposition of dust on plastic containers. See, British Patent Application 2,078,760, page 1, lines 8-9. This reference does not teach roughening the inner surface of its containers. Even though it was asserted in the Office Action that the inner surface of this reference has some degree of roughness, there is no support in the reference for this assertion. In fact, roughening the surface is contrary to the stated purpose of this reference, namely the prevention of sticking of dust particles. See, *Id.* Further it was asserted that the surface of Applicants claimed container are polished rather than roughened, and Applicants reject that assertion. See, U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2008-0060950, paragraph 49. Given that British Patent Application 2,078,760 does not suggest roughening, it is unlikely that one of ordinary skill would roughen the same surface to any degree and particularly to the degree required by Applicants' claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 15-19 and 49-51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) British Patent

Application 2,078,760 has been overcome and should be withdrawn, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action claims 1 and 7-26 were rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese document 52-93398 in view of Neefe. ... Japanese document-398 is applied essentially for reasons of record as set forth in the previous action, the reference failing to teach that the PVP additive is added to the polymer prior to molding the base. However, Neefe provides a teaching to one of ordinary skill in this art that coating already formed molds would be equivalent to adding the coating material to the polymer prior to making it into the mold. While this teaching is disclosed with respect to a release agent, it is submitted that it would have applicability to whatever additive one desires to incorporate into a plastic article. (citations omitted)

Applicants traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

Applicants' claimed invention requires the addition of a particular additive(s) prior to forming the molded base. Not all additives will work, as disclosed in Examples 1-3 of Applicants' specification. Neefe teaches one type of release agent, Silicone Oil 87-X66 and does not teach the use of PVP in any capacity. Given that so many additives do not produce desired articles, the Office Action's assertion that releasing agents are equivalent to additive agents is not reasonable to one of ordinary skill in the art. Further Claims 15-26 require roughening of the surface of the molded base. Neither Japanese Patent Application No. 52-93398 nor Neefe teach roughening of their containers. Therefore the requirements of Applicant's claimed invention, namely the addition of a particular additive(s) prior to formation of the molded base (claims 6-10 and 15-26) and an inner surface roughness (claims 15-26) would not be suggested to one of ordinary skill over of Japanese Patent Application No. 52-93398 in view of Neefe. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1 and 7-26 in view of these references has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and solicit such notice. In the event the Examiner believes that an interview would expedite the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned agent directly.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruby T. Hope/  
Ruby T. Hope  
Reg. No. 34, 350  
Attorney for the Applicant(s)

Johnson and Johnson  
One Johnson and Johnson Plaza  
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08933  
(732) 524-1024  
Dated: December 22, 2008